REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. Claims 11 and 20 are canceled and new claims 21 and 22 are added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 16-11 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant has amended the claims to address the Examiner's concern. Therefore. reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakamichi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 2002/0085498 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In Nakamichi, the processing unit 30 provides all functions for calculating the shortest path and generating the routing table, including functions of the LSDB search unit of the present application (see, for example, FIG. 2 (reference numeral 30) and [0052]-[0055] of Nakamichi). However, in accordance with such a constitution, there is a problem in which all operations are processed by the processing unit 30 and that can be a large amount of processing load.

Compared to Nakamichi, applicant's claimed invention includes a "link state database (LSDB) search unit that is provided in an interface . . .", and each of the interfaces (such as the interface cards) detects whether the control packet is new or old (". . . a personal computer card is used as an RS . . ." (page 2, line 15), "comprising: . . . a unit that . . . determine whether the newly received information is new or old" (claim 12)). Therefore, it is possible to detect the newest packets and such an operation is conducted by each of the interfaces (from line 21 page 9 to page 10). It should be noted that in the conventional technique, all operations regarding multiple control packets input from multiple interfaces are conducted by the RS (processing unit 30 of Nakamichi). In accordance with a constitution of the present application, it is possible to reduce processing load of the RS (line 9 of page 31). Nakamichi does not teach or suggest determining whether newly received information is new or old as recited in claim 12 of the present invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 12, along with claims depending therefrom, defines patentable subject matter over Nakamichi. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basu et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0100950 A1) in view of Nakamichi et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0085498 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With reference to claim 1, applicant's claimed invention recites "a unit that stores an item that uniquely identifies the information among the classified items in the TCAM and

stores the rest of the items to the external memory", that is, "an item that uniquely identifies the information" collected by using a routing protocol is stored "in the TCAM" (Claim 1). In addition, "the rest of the items" are stored in the "external memory" (Claim 1). Figure 14 shows concrete examples of the items.

Compared to the present application, in Basu, a combination of the TCAM and the external memory is disclosed (FIG. 1 of Basu). However, in Basu, only a tree of the routing table is stored in the TCAM. Therefore, Basu stores an address of a router, that is, the next hop in the external memory (FIGS. 1 and 4A). In other words, Basu fails to disclose storing the remained of items to an external memory.

In addition, in Nakamichi, the link state shown in FIG. 3 is stored in the link state database (32a), and the opaque LSA is stored in the opaque LSA database (32b) (FIG. 2). However, Nakamichi does not distinguish the "item that uniquely identifies the information" and the item that does not uniquely identify the information. Since neither reference teaches distinguishing items that uniquely identify from items that do not uniquely identify, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, along with claims depending therefrom, defines patentable subject matter over this combination of references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Dated: _MAY 27, 2008_

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Timothy D. MacIntyre
Registration No.: 42,824
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1230
Attorney for Applicant